



COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

"To Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service"

900 SOUTH FREMONT AVENUE
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91803-1331
Telephone: (626) 458-5100
www.ladpw.org

ADDRESS ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:
P.O. BOX 1460
ALHAMBRA, CALIFORNIA 91802-1460

October 7, 2004

IN REPLY PLEASE

REFER TO FILE: **PD-3**

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
County of Los Angeles
383 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration
500 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Dear Supervisors:

**EASTMAN AVENUE, ET AL., PHASE II
NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND AUTHORITY TO PROCEED
SUPERVISORIAL DISTRICT 1
3 VOTES**

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT YOUR BOARD:

1. Consider the Negative Declaration for the proposed project to provide roadway improvements within the City Terrace community, concur that the project will not have a significant affect on the environment, find that the Negative Declaration reflects the independent judgment of the County, and approve the Negative Declaration.
2. Approve the project and authorize Public Works to carry out the project.
3. Find that the proposed project will have no adverse affect on wildlife resources, and authorize Public Works to complete and file a Certificate of Fee Exemption with the County Clerk.

PURPOSE/JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDED ACTION

The purpose of this project is to improve roadway conditions on several streets within the City Terrace region of Los Angeles County. The work includes reconstructing existing roadway pavement; widening portions of the roadway; installing storm drains and catch basins; and constructing curb and gutter, driveways, and staircases. The surrounding area is zoned for multi-family, residential dwellings and consists of

developed and undeveloped parcels of land. Portions of the project involve work within private property to construct private driveways and staircases; permits to enter will be obtained in these cases

Beginning at Herbert Circle, drainage facilities will be added to gather stormwater from the street to convey it north along Herbert Avenue. This water, gathered by five catch basins, will be discharged through a parkway drain north of the drainage system collection points near the intersection of Harris Street and Herbert Avenue.

In order to add paved width to the roadway in some portions of the project, grade differences will be mediated by the installation of retaining walls and/or slough walls. The project includes approximately 2,600 linear feet of concrete block retaining wall, reaching a maximum height of eight feet in several locations.

An environmental impact analysis/documentation is a California Environmental Quality Act requirement that is to be used in evaluating the environmental impacts of this project and should be considered in the approval of this project. As the project administrator, we are also the lead agency in terms of meeting the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

The Initial Study of Environmental Factors indicated that the proposed project would not have a significant affect on the environment. Therefore, in accordance with the Environmental Document Reporting Procedures and Guidelines, adopted by your Board on November 17, 1987, a Negative Declaration was prepared and circulated for public review.

Implementation of Strategic Plan Goals

This action is consistent with the County's Strategic Plan Goal of Service Excellence as this action will improve the quality of life in the County by providing roadway improvements in several neighborhoods within the community of City Terrace.

FISCAL IMPACT/FINANCING

Sufficient funds to fund Preliminary Engineering are included in the 2004-05 Fiscal Year. Funding for construction of the project is proposed to be included in the future Road Fund Budget. The estimated construction cost of the project is \$1,365,000. A construction contract will be advertised for bids at a later date, contingent on your approval of this action.

FACTS AND PROVISIONS/LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Under the California Environmental Quality Act, any lead agency preparing a negative declaration must provide a public notice within a reasonable period of time prior to certification of the negative declaration. To comply with this requirement, a Public Notice pursuant to Section 21092 of the Public Resources Code was published in the Eastside Sun on July 15, 2004. A copy of the Negative Declaration was provided to City Terrace Library for public review. Notices regarding the availability of the Negative Declaration were also mailed to residents within the vicinity of the project.

The public review period for the Negative Declaration ended on August 16, 2004. We received no comments in reference to this project.

Based upon the Initial Study of Environmental Factors, it was determined that the project will not have a significant affect on the environment. Therefore, approval of the Negative Declaration is requested at this time.

ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTATION

California Environmental Quality Act requires public agency decision makers to document and consider the environmental implication of their action.

Your Board is being asked to approve and authorize Public Works to carry out this project.

A fee must be paid to the State Department of Fish and Game when certain notices, required by the California Environmental Quality Act, are filed with the County Clerk. The County is exempt from paying this fee when the Board finds that a project will have no impacts on wildlife resources. The Initial Study of Environmental Factors concluded that there will be no adverse affects on wildlife resources.

Upon approval of the Negative Declaration by your Board, Public Works will file a Certificate of Fee Exemption with the County Clerk. A \$25 handling fee will be paid to the County Clerk for processing. We will also file a Notice of Determination in accordance with the requirements of Section 21152(a) of the California Public Resources Code.

IMPACT ON CURRENT SERVICES (OR PROJECTS)

The project will not have an impact on current services or projects.

The Honorable Board of Supervisors
October 7, 2004
Page 4

CONCLUSION

Please return one approved copy of this letter to Public Works.

Respectfully submitted,

DONALD L. WOLFE
Interim Director of Public Works

JM:yr

C050439

P:\pdpub\Temp\EP&A\EU\Projects\Eastman, Et al Phase II\ND\Eastman ND Board Letter.doc

Enc.

cc: Chief Administrative Office
County Counsel

**COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

**NEGATIVE DECLARATION
FOR
EASTMAN AVENUE, ET AL., PHASE II**

I. Location and Brief Description

The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works is proposing to perform roadway improvements on several streets within the City Terrace region of Los Angeles County. City Terrace is located in the San Gabriel Valley and lies between the Cities of Los Angeles and Monterey Park.

The work includes reconstructing existing roadway pavement; widening portions of the roadway; installing storm drains and catch basins; and constructing curb and gutter, driveways, and staircases. The surrounding area is zoned for multi-family, residential dwellings and consists of developed and undeveloped parcels of land. Portions of the project involve work within private property to construct private driveways and staircases; permits to enter will be obtained in these cases.

Beginning at Herbert Circle, drainage facilities will be added to gather stormwater from the street to convey it north along Herbert Avenue. This water, gathered by five catch basins, will be discharged through a parkway drain north of the drainage system collection points near the intersection of Harris Street and Herbert Avenue.

In order to add paved width to the roadway in some portions of the project, grade differences will be mediated by the installation of retaining walls and/or slough walls. The project includes approximately 2,600 linear feet of concrete block retaining wall, reaching a maximum height of eight feet in several locations.

II. Mitigation Measures Included in the Project to Avoid Potentially Significant Effects

No significant effects are identified. However, mitigation measures are discussed in Section XVIII of the Initial Study and in the Discussion of Environmental Factors (Attachment A).

III. Finding of No Significant Effect

Based on the attached Initial Study and Attachment A, it has been determined that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

JM:yr

P:\PDPUB\Temp\EP&A\EU\Projects\Eastman, Et al Phase II\ND\Eastman, Et al Phase II_ND(rev).doc

Attach.

INITIAL STUDY OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS

1. **Project Title:** Eastman Avenue, et al. Phase II
2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 11th Floor, Programs Development Division, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, California 91803-1331.
3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Mr. John Merrifield (626) 458-5192.
4. **Project Location:** City Terrace, unincorporated Los Angeles County
5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, 900 South Fremont Avenue, Alhambra, California 91803-1331.
6. **General Plan Designation:** County of Los Angeles.
7. **Zoning:** Residential.
8. **Description of Project:** The County of Los Angeles Department of Public Works is proposing to reconstruct existing roadway pavement; widen portions of the roadway; install storm drains and catch basins; and construct curb and gutter, driveways, and staircases.

All construction is located in the City Terrace region of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The surrounding area is residential and consists of developed and undeveloped parcels of land.

Beginning at Herbert Circle, drainage facilities will be added to gather stormwater from the street to convey it north along Herbert Avenue. This water will be discharged through a parkway drain north of the drainage system collection points near the intersection of Harris Street and Herbert Avenue.

In order to add paved width to the roadway in some portions of the project, grade differences will be mediated by the installation of retaining walls and/or slough walls. The project includes approximately 2,600 linear feet of concrete block retaining wall, reaching a maximum height of eight feet in several locations.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Settings:**
 - A. **Project Site-**The proposed project is located in a residential area of the City Terrace region of unincorporated Los Angeles County. The majority of the project area consists of relatively steep grades. Vegetation in the project area consists of palm and other trees/bushes and some weeds.

- B. Surrounding Properties**-The surrounding properties consist of residential units. Most parcels have been developed; however, there remain several undeveloped parcels. Wildlife in the area is limited to domestic animals, birds, and insects.

10. Other agencies whose approval is required (and permits needed):

No other permits or approvals are required for this project.

JM:yr

P:\PDPUB\Temp\EP&A\EU\Projects\Eastman, Et al Phase II\ND\Eastman, Et al Phase II_ND(rev).doc

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Geology/Soils
<input type="checkbox"/> Hazards & Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning
<input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Noise	<input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic
<input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Service Systems	<input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings of Significance	

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☒ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a potentially significant impact or potentially significant unless mitigated impact on the environment, but at least one effect a) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and b) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project would have a significant effect on the environment because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

John Merrifield
Printed Name

Date

County of Los Angeles Department. of Public Works
For

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) "Potential Significant Impact" is appropriate if an effect is significant or potentially significant, or if the lead agency lacks information to make a finding of insignificance. If there are one or more "Potential Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.
- 4) "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potential Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVIII, "Earlier Analysis," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR or other California Environmental Quality Act process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). Earlier analyses are discussed in Section XVIII at the end of the checklist.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). See the sample question below. A source list should be attached and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. <u>AESTHETICS</u> - Would the project:					
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?			X
	b)	Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?			X
	c)	Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?		X	
	d)	Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?			X
II. <u>AGRICULTURE RESOURCES</u> - In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:					
	a)	Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?			X
	b)	Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?			X
	c)	Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to nonagricultural use?			X
III. <u>AIR QUALITY</u> - Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:					
	a)	Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?			X
	b)	Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?		X	
	c)	Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for zone precursors)?			X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	d)	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?			X	
	e)	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?			X	
IV. <u>BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
	b)	Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?				X
	c)	Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?				X
	d)	Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident, migratory fish, or wildlife species; or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors; or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?				X
	e)	Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
	f)	Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan; Natural Community Conservation Plan; or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan?				X
V. <u>CULTURAL RESOURCES</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?				X
	b)	Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?				X
	c)	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
	d)	Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
VI. <u>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</u> - Would the project:					
	a)	Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:			
	i)	Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a know fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.			X
	ii)	Strong seismic ground shaking?			X
	iii)	Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X
	iv)	Landslides?			X
	b)	Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?		X	
	c)	Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?			X
	d)	Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?			X
	e)	Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?			X
VII. <u>HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</u> - Would the project:					
	a)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?			X
	b)	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?		X	
	c)	Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?		X	
	d)	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code, Section 65962.5, and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?			X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
	f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				X
	g)	Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?			X	
	h)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				X
VIII. <u>HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?				X
	b)	Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?				X
	c)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?			X	
	d)	Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?			X	
	e)	Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				X
	f)	Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?				X
	g)	Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	h)	Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				X
	i)	Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				X
	j)	Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				X
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:						
	a)	Physically divide an established community?				X
	b)	Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				X
	c)	Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the project:						
	a)	Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?				X
	b)	Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?				X
XI. NOISE - Would the project result in:						
	a)	Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?			X	
	b)	Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?			X	
	c)	A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
	d)	A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			X	
	e)	For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	f)	For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				X
XII. <u>POPULATION AND HOUSING</u> - Would the project:						
	a)	Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (e.g., by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (e.g., through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?				X
	b)	Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
	c)	Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X
XIII. <u>PUBLIC SERVICES</u> -						
	a)	Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
		Fire protection?				X
		Police protection?				X
		Schools?				X
		Parks?				X
		Other public facilities?				X
XIV. <u>RECREATION</u> -						
	a)	Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				X
	b)	Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				X

		Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. <u>TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC</u> - Would the project:					
	a)	Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?		X	
	b)	Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County Congestion Management Agency for designated roads or highways?			X
	c)	Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?			X
	d)	Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?			X
	e)	Result in inadequate emergency access?		X	
	f)	Result in inadequate parking capacity?			X
	g)	Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?			X
XVI. <u>UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS</u> - Would the project:					
	a)	Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?			X
	b)	Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X
	c)	Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?		X	
	d)	Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?			X
	e)	Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?			X
	f)	Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?		X	

			Potential Significant Impact	Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
	g)	Comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?			X	
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE -						
	a)	Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				X
	b)	Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively Considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)				X
	c)	Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				X

XVIII. DISCUSSION OF WAYS TO MITIGATE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS -

Section 15041 (a) of the State CEQA guidelines states that a lead agency for a project has authority to require changes in any or all activities involved in the project in order to lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment. No significant effects have been identified. However, the following standard mitigation measures have been included:

Air Quality

\$ Compliance with applicable air pollution control regulations.

Noise

\$ Compliance with all applicable noise and ordinances during construction.

\$ Construction activities would be restricted to the County appointed construction times.

Transportation

- Advance notification of all street and/or lane closures and detours to all emergency service agencies and affected residents.
- Clear delineations and barricades to designate through traffic lanes.

ATTACHMENT A
DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS
EASTMAN AVENUE, ET AL. PHASE II

I. AESTHETICS - Would the proposal:

a) *Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?*

No impact. The proposed project does not involve a scenic vista.

b) *Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway?*

No impact. The proposed project does not involve any scenic resources or State scenic highways.

c) *Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?*

Less than significant impact. The proposed project involves roadway improvements that include pavement reconstruction; retaining wall construction; and installation of curb and gutter, guardrails, driveways, staircases, and drainage facilities. The construction requires removal of some trees, none of which are protected or of special concern, and removal/relocation of some small structures. These activities would have less than a significant effect on the overall visual character and quality of the project site.

The project involves the installation of approximately 2,600 linear feet of concrete block retaining wall. These retaining structures vary in height, reaching a maximum height of 8 feet in several locations. The retaining structures reach this 8-foot maximum height at six points along De Garmo Drive and at two points along Eastman Avenue. The heights of the retaining walls have been evaluated with respect to their effect on the visual character of the project area. Considering that the wall height is limited to 8 feet, this effect on the visual character of the project area is less than significant.

The proposed project's construction activities slightly alter the general view of the area, but not substantially. Therefore, the proposed project's impact on the visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings is less than significant.

- d) ***Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?***

No impact. The project does not create a new source of light or glare and will not adversely impact day or nighttime views in this respect.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES - Would the proposal:

- a) ***Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to nonagricultural use?***

No impact. The proposed project is located in the City Terrace region of the unincorporated Los Angeles County. The surrounding land consists of developed and undeveloped residential parcels. The project location is not used for agricultural purposes or as farmland. Thus, the project will have no impact due to farmland conversion.

- b) ***Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?***

No impact. The proposed project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use and does not violate any Williamson Act contracts.

- c) ***Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to nonagricultural use?***

No impact. The proposed project does not involve changes in the existing environment that would result in the conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use.

III. AIR QUALITY - Would the proposal:

- a) ***Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?***

No impact. Among other regulations, Public Works currently complies with dust control measures enforced by the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The proposed project will not conflict with the current implementation of the applicable air quality plan.

- b) *Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?***

Less than significant impact. Construction-related emissions and dust would be emitted during project construction. However, these effects would be temporary and would not significantly alter the ambient air quality of the area. Construction activities are restricted to the construction times allowed by the County of Los Angeles except during emergency situations. These impacts on air quality are temporary and less than significant.

- c) *Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is nonattainment under an applicable Federal or State ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?***

No impact. The emissions generated as a result of the proposed project occur only during construction. These temporary emissions are not expected to result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of pollutants for which the project area is considered nonattainment. Project specifications would require the contractor to comply with Federal and state emission control regulations. Similarly, the proposed project construction should not lead to emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors.

- d) *Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?***

Less than significant impact. Sensitive receptors in the area may be subjected to dust and construction equipment emissions during the project construction. Project specifications would require the contractor to control dust by appropriate means such as sweeping and/or watering and to comply with all applicable air pollution control regulations. The impact is less than significant because exposure to construction emissions is temporary and precautions would be taken to mitigate this exposure.

- e) *Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?***

Less than significant impact. Objectionable odors may be generated by the equipment used for the construction of the project. The impact due to creating objectionable odors is less than significant since the odors would be temporary and short-term.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES - Would the proposal:

- a) *Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

No impact. No sensitive or special status species, or any species identified as a candidate in local or regional plans, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are known to exist at the project site. Accordingly, the proposed project is not expected to impact sensitive or special status species or their respective habitat.

- b) *Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?***

No impact. The project is to be constructed mostly within the existing public road right of way. Driveways, staircases, and minimal paving may occur outside of the public right of way. Permits to enter will be obtained in these cases. None of this land is designated as riparian or as sensitive natural habitat. Therefore, no impacts to a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community would occur.

- c) *Have a substantial adverse effect on Federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?***

No impact. No portion of the proposed project area is a Federally-protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Therefore, the proposed project would not have any adverse impact on Federally-protected wetlands habitat.

- d) *Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?***

No impact. There are no migratory wildlife corridors located within the proposed project location. The project will have no impact on the movement of native residents, migratory fish, or wildlife species. No native wildlife nursery sites will be rendered useless as a result of the proposed project.

- e) ***Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?***

No impact. The project would not conflict with any local biological resources protection policies/ordinances. There is a protection of oak trees in the local area of the project; however, this project does not involve the removal of any oak trees.

- f) ***Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?***

No impact. The proposed project will not have an impact on any local, regional, or state habitat conservation plans since no known plan exists within the project site.

V. **CULTURAL RESOURCES - Would the proposal:**

- a-d) ***Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5, cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a an archaeological resource, directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature, or disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?***

No impact. The project area is comprised of both developed and undeveloped parcels. The developed portion consists of the public roads and private residences, while the undeveloped portion is primarily limited to empty residential lots. There is not known to be any archaeological resources within the project vicinity. Accordingly, the project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act guidelines. However, because the project involves grading and excavation, there exists the potential for disturbance of buried archaeological components. In the event that archaeological resources are discovered as a result of construction activity, work shall be halted until the find is evaluated by a qualified archaeologist.

VI. **GEOLOGY AND SOILS - Would the proposal:**

- a) ***Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:***

- i) ***Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.***

No impact. The project site contains no known underlying active faults and is not anticipated to be the site of a fault rupture during a seismic event.

- ii) ***Strong seismic ground shaking?***

No impact. The proposed project requires excavation and grading of soil. These activities are not known to trigger a strong seismic ground shaking. Additionally, the project area has not been the epicenter of any known earthquakes. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking.

- iii) ***Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?***

No impact. The project area is not known to have suffered any ground failure due to seismic events and is not identified as a potential liquefaction area. Thus, the proposed project should have no impact with respect to seismic ground failure including the liquefaction of soil.

- iv) ***Landslides?***

No impact. The project location is in a residential area consisting of relatively steep terrain. There is modeled landslide risk terrain on both sides of the road for most of the project. However, the construction is taking place within and along the road right of way, which is situated along the crests of the hills. These portions of the hills are not identified as landslide risk areas. Therefore, the project is not expected to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides.

- b) ***Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?***

Less than significant impact. Construction of the proposed project would result in the disruption, displacement, and compaction of soil. Project specifications would require the contractor to properly control erosion, compact dirt, and dispose of any excess excavated materials. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on the loss of topsoil or erosion is less than significant.

- c) ***Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?***

No impact. The proposed project site is not located on an unstable geologic unit or soil. Additionally, the project is not expected cause the geologic unit or soil at the site to become unstable.

- d) ***Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?***

No impact. The soil at the project location is not known to be expansive. Therefore, the proposed project should not create substantial risks to life or property related to soil expansion.

- e) ***Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?***

No impact. There is no impact in this respect because the project is not located in an area that is lacking sewer. The project will not necessitate the installation of any septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS - Would the proposal:

- a) ***Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?***

No impact. The project does not include the routine transport of hazardous materials. There is no known contamination of any soil that is to be excavated. If any contamination is encountered during construction, the project specifications would require the contractor to treat or dispose of any excavated soil or material off-site. There should be no impact with respect to creating a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.

- b-c) ***Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment or emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous materials, substances or wastes within one quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?***

Less than significant impact. Combustion engine fluids from construction equipment are potentially hazardous substances. Necessary precautions would be taken to prevent the spilling of any hazardous substances that may affect the public or the environment within the project vicinity. It is unlikely that an explosion, emission, or release of hazardous or acutely hazardous

substances occur as a result of the proposed project. Project specifications would require the contractor to properly maintain all equipment during construction. In the event of a fluid spill, the contractor is required to remediate according to all applicable laws regarding chemical clean-up. The proposed project is not anticipated to result in hazardous emissions or a hazardous substance spilling; thus, the project impact on the public or environment is less than significant.

- d) ***Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code, Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?***

No impact. The project site is not known to be a Section 65962.5 hazardous materials site; therefore, the proposed project does not pose a significant threat to the public or the environment in this respect.

- e) ***For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***

No impact. The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public use airport. Therefore, the work would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in these type of areas.

- f) ***For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?***

No impact. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the work would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in this type of area.

- g) ***Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?***

Less than significant impact. The project site is located primarily within the public road right of way and, therefore, may temporarily interfere with emergency response procedures or an existing emergency evacuation plan. The local emergency services (fire, police, etc.) will receive proper notification in the event that construction necessitates temporary road closures. There will be no permanent effect on these emergency plans as a result of the proposed project. This effect on the emergency response/evacuation plan is less than significant.

- h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?***

No impact. The proposed project site is not located within wildlands. The construction is to take place in a residential area. Thus, the proposed project would not expose people or structures to a risk involving wildland fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY - Would the proposal:

- a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?***

No impact. The proposed project involves the installation of a local drainage system including catch basins, storm drain piping, and a parkway drain. This system will not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements. Best Management Practices will be used to ensure that the project does not discharge trash or debris into the water system. Therefore, the project should have no impact on water quality.

- b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?***

No impact. The proposed project would not result in the use of additional groundwater that would cause a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the groundwater table. No impacts to groundwater supplies or groundwater recharge are expected to occur as a result of the proposed project.

- c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project involves altering the existing drainage of the project site by installing a local storm drainage system. However, little to no erosion or siltation impacts would result.

- d) ***Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project involves the installation of a local drainage system including catch basins, storm drain piping, and a parkway drain. Runoff will be gathered by five catch basins along North Herbert Avenue and will be conveyed to the north. The runoff will discharge through a parkway drain located near the corner of Harris Street and North Herbert Avenue. Two to three cubic feet per second of water is expected to discharge onto Harris Street. Harris Street has been determined to have the capacity to retain this amount of runoff. Flooding is not expected to occur on- or off-site under normal conditions. Therefore, the project will have less than a significant impact with respect to on- or off-site flooding as a result of these drainage system modifications.

- e) ***Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?***

No impact. The construction of the project will not result in additional surface water runoff. Therefore, the project should not impact existing or planned stormwater drainage systems by exceeding their capacity.

- f) ***Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?***

No impact. The project alters the conveyance of storm water, but does not discharge any additional runoff or increase the turbidity of the existing runoff. The proposed project should have no impact on the water quality of the area.

- g) ***Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a Federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?***

No impact. The proposed project would not place any housing.

- h) ***Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?***

No impact. The proposed project will not place any structures within a 100-year flood, which would impede or redirect flood flows.

- i) ***Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?***

No impact. The proposed project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from floods. No flooding due to a failure of a levee or dam would result from the project.

- j) ***Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?***

No impact. The proposed project will not cause any inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the proposal:

- a) ***Physically divide an established community?***

No impact. The project would not introduce a barrier that would divide the physical arrangement of the established residential community.

- b) ***Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?***

No impact. The proposed project would not conflict with the zoning of the project area. Likewise, the project does not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or agency regulation.

- c) ***Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?***

No impact. The proposed project does not conflict with any habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan adopted by any agency or community.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES - Would the proposal:

- a) ***Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?***

No impact. The proposed project would not deplete or result in the loss of availability of any valued mineral resources. The project has no impact on mineral resources.

- b) *Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?***

No impact. The project site is not identified as a resource recovery site in the local general plan, specific plan, or any other land use plan. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on any locally-important mineral resource recovery sites.

XI. NOISE - Would the proposal result in:

- a) *Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?***

Less than significant impact. Noise levels within the proposed project site would increase slightly during construction activities. However, the impact is temporary and is subject to existing noise ordinances and standards. The contractor would be required to comply with the construction hours specified by the County of Los Angeles noise control ordinances. Since the construction period will last for a short period and the project would not expose people to severe noise levels, this temporary impact to noise levels is less than significant.

- b) *Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?***

Less than significant impact. Construction of the proposed project would require the use of equipment that would generate groundborne vibration and/or groundborne noise. The project specifications would require the contractor to comply with all noise laws and ordinances. The project's effects in this respect are less than significant since construction would be for a short period and would not expose people to long-term, excessive noise levels.

- c-d) *A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project or a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project would not result in any permanent or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. However, the project vicinity would be subject to a minor increase in noise levels during construction. The temporary increase in noise level due to trucks hauling debris would be infrequent and is less than significant.

- e-f) ***For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels or for a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?***

No impact. The proposed project is not located within the vicinity of a public airport, public use airport, private airstrip, or an airport land use plan. People residing or working in these type of locations would not be affected by the proposed project.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING - Would the proposal:

- a) ***Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?***

No impact. The proposed project will not induce population growth. It will provide an upgrade in the roadway conditions and better storm drainage facilities for the project area. Most of the surrounding area is developed already and these roadway improvements are not expected to alter the growth rate of the local human population.

- b) ***Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

No impact. The proposed roadway improvements will require the displacement of portions of three existing structures. A portion of the porch at 1101 North Herbert Avenue lies within the public road right of way. This porch will be removed. The carport located at 1083 North Herbert Avenue will be removed because it also lies within existing road right of way. The support columns for the porch at 1053 North Herbert Avenue are currently in the public road right of way. They will be removed and replaced by columns located on the existing right of way line. The proposed project will not temporarily or permanently displace any people. Relocation and/or replacement housing will not be necessary for this project.

- c) ***Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?***

No impact. The proposed project requires permitted, temporary access to a number of private properties to construct pavement, stairways, and driveways. Additionally, the project includes the alteration or removal of structures that lie within the public right of way. None of this work would require the displacement of any people, nor would it necessitate any replacement housing.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICE - Would the proposal:

- a) ***Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services: Fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, other public facilities?***

No impact. The project will not affect public service and will not result in a need for new or altered governmental services in fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities. Existing services for the area will be sufficient. Public Works will coordinate with the police and fire departments regarding construction scheduling to prevent response time delays. Thus, the project would have no impact on these services.

XIV. RECREATION - Would the proposal:

- a) ***Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?***

No impact. The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood or regional parks.

- b) ***Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?***

No impact. The proposed project does not include recreational facilities and does not require the construction or expansion of any recreational facilities.

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC - Would the proposal:

- a) ***Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project may require disposal of excess material and transportation of construction equipment to the project site. This could minimally increase the existing traffic in the surrounding area. However, this temporary impact is only during construction and is less than significant.

- b) *Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?***

No impact. The proposed project would not result in any changes to the existing level of service.

- c) *Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?***

No impact. The proposed project will have no impact on air traffic patterns.

- d) *Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?***

No impact. The proposed project does not involve any design features that are known to constitute safety hazards. Therefore, the project would not have any impact regarding increasing hazards due to a design feature.

- e) *Result in inadequate emergency access?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project site is mostly within the public road right of way. Temporary road closures and/or detours may occur during construction. Emergency access on the streets around the project site will be maintained at all times possible, and emergency service agencies will receive proper notification of any road closures or detours that may occur. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on emergency access.

- f) *Result in inadequate parking capacity?***

No impact. The proposed project would not permanently remove any currently available parking spaces.

- g) *Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?***

No impact. The proposed project would not conflict with any adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS - Would the proposal:

- a) *Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?***

No impact. The project will not result in contamination or an increase in discharge of wastewater that might affect wastewater treatment. Thus, the proposed project would have no impact regarding compliance with the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

- b) *Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

No impact. The proposed project will not result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore, no impact to the environment would occur as a result of new treatment facilities being constructed.

- c) *Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?***

Less than significant impact. The proposed project will result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities. These facilities will convey storm water in subterranean storm drains instead of allowing the water to sheet flow down the roadway surface of North Herbert Avenue. This change in the drainage system is not expected to cause erosion, soil deposition, or flooding. The installation of the drainage facilities as part of this project would have a less than significant impact on the environment.

- d) *Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?***

No impact. The proposed project will not result in a need for additional water supplies. Therefore, the project will have no impact on existing water supply entitlements and resources.

- e) *Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?***

No impact. No increase in the number of wastewater discharge facilities will occur as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project will have no impact on the wastewater treatment provider's ability to serve the project area.

- f-g) *Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs and comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?***

Less than significant impact. Construction of the proposed project will result in excess materials and construction debris. Any solid waste generated will be disposed of by the contractor in accordance with all Federal, State, and local regulations relating to solid waste. Therefore, the impact of the proposed project on Federal, State, and local solid waste statutes or regulations is less than significant.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE - Would the proposal:

- a) *have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?***

No impact. Based on findings in this environmental review, the proposed project does not have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish and wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

- b) *have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects?)***

No impact. When considered in conjunction with past and probable future projects in the project vicinity, the proposed project does not have any significant impacts on the environment. Thus, the project does not have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable.

- c) *Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?***

No impact. The proposed project would not have direct or indirect, substantially detrimental, environmental impacts on human beings.